UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/008,192	12/07/2001	Steven E. Adams	P-107292.01(CIP)	4137

7590 06/24/2005

William B. Nash
JACKSON WALKER L.L.P.
Suite 2100
112 E. Pecan Street
San Antonio, TX 78205

EXAMINER	
TRAN, QUOC A	
ART UNIT	**PAPER NUMBER**
2176	

DATE MAILED: 06/24/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/008,192	ADAMS ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Quoc A. Tran	2176	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *07 December 2001*.

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-52* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-52* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. 09/767,422 and 60/314,715.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *12/07/2001*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to Application, filed 13/07/2001. This Application is a CIP of 09/767,422 filed 01/19/2001 which claims the benefit of Application 60/314,715.

2. Claims 1-52 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 17 and 33 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Independent claims 1, 17 and 33** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being as being unpatentable over Aegerter US 20020069192A1- Provisional No. 60/251,285- filed 12/04/2000 (hereinafter Aegerter), in view of Wanderski et al. US006519617B1 – filed 04/08/1999 (hereinafter Wanderski).

In regard to independent claim 1, a) providing a processing unit capable of receiving electronic data (as taught by Aegerter, page 2 paragraph [0035]), **b) further providing a storage device coupled to said processing unit** (as taught by Aegerter, page 3 paragraph [0040]), **c) accessing one or more electronic data files, each said data file having a structure** (as taught by Aegerter, page 3 paragraph [0040]), **d) analyzing said one or more electronic**

data files to identify record break information contained therein (Aegerter, page 2 paragraph [0035], discloses an xml schema , xpath, xsl, xslt, xlink , wherein the electronic data file can be analyzed in a unique way to create a class for portable, wherein the broadest reasonable interpretation as claimed, such that xml schema and is reasonable equivalent to analyzing the electronic data files and tags language is reasonable equivalent to identify record break information), **h) generating output data describing said structure of said one or more electronic data files** however (Aegerter at page 1 paragraph [0014], describes rendering of that data wherein a data retrieval "servlet" executes a query, and converts the results to an XML data stream, and creates a data stream as output for communication to a client computer).

Aegerter does not explicitly teach, **e) utilizing said record break information, parsing said one or more data files into one or more electronic data records,** however (Wanderski at col. 4, lines 25-45, discloses an xml parser whereby a DTD (document type definition) is dynamically generated in a manner of presentation to user context design), **f) analyzing each of said electronic data records to identify field break information contained therein** however (Wanderski at col. 4, lines 25-45, discloses an xml parser whereby a DTD (document type definition) is dynamically generated in a manner of presentation to user context design), **g) utilizing said field break information, parsing each of said data records into one or more data fields** however (Wanderski at col. 4, lines 25-45, discloses an xml parser whereby a DTD is dynamically generated in a manner of presentation to user context design, wherein the xml is a well-formed notation (i.e. opening tags corresponding closing tags for example: <email/>)),

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teaching of Aegerter, provides computer-

implemented system and methods for deploying a distributed client-server system, enabling read-write distributed data interfaces for host database systems, to includes an xml parser whereby a DTD (document type definition), the tags of a document is utilized for dynamically generated the output document. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide user the ability to define their own tags, to define data model by parsing the tags of the data model from the received document, the receiving application can re-create the information for display, printing, or other processing, as the generating application intended it (as taught by Wanderski at col. 2, lines 25-45).

In regard to independent claims 17 and 33, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

7. **Dependent claims 2-16, 18-32 and 34-52** are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being as being unpatentable over Aegerter US 20020069192A1- Provisional No. 60/251,285- filed 12/04/2000 (hereinafter Aegerter), in view of Wanderski et al. US006519617B1 – filed 04/08/1999 (hereinafter Wanderski).

In regard to dependent claims 2-5, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and further view of the following, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale, **updating said output data, storing said output data within said storage device, assigning a tokenized symbolic identifier to one or more of said data fields, providing a user interface through which a user may modify said output data, said user interface coupled to said storage device** (as taught by Aegerter, page 10 paragraphs [0214]-[0223]).

In regard to dependent claim 6, utilizing said output data, generating a translation document capable of translating electronic documents into one or more predefined formats (Aegerter at page 10 paragraph [0215], discloses XSLT style sheet wherein the input electronic data files can transformed into another pre-defined format).

In regard to dependent claim 7, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claim 1 above, and is similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 8, testing said first plurality of data files (as taught Aegerter at page 10 paragraph [0317]).

In regard to dependent claim 9, identifying a file type associated with each of said electronic data files (as describes by Aegerter at page 1 paragraph [0011]).

In regard to dependent claim 10, combining substantially similar electronic data files (as describes by Aegerter at page 17 paragraph [0367]).

In regard to dependent claim 11, identifying one or more types of said electronic data records; and analyzing said record type of each of said electronic data records to determine a degree of similarity (as taught Aegerter at page 10 paragraph [0317]).

In regard to dependent claim 12, representing said cardinality of each said record type within said data file (as taught by Aegerter at page 4 paragraph [0083], discloses a task scheduler, such as computational resources based on priority, aging, deadlines, load, etc).

In regard to dependent claim 13, representing said sequence of representation for each said record type within said data file (Aegerter at page 14 paragraph [0300], discloses the sequence number).

In regard to dependent claim 14, representing said degree of similarity of each said record type within said output data (Aegerter at page 13 paragraph [0283], discloses the reconciliation accuracy, performance and automation, units of information managed by the invention can be uniquely identified at a fine degree of granularity).

In regard to dependent claim 15, representing said cardinality of each said record type within said data file (Aegerter at page 13 paragraph [0283], discloses the reconciliation accuracy, performance and automation, units of information managed by the invention can be uniquely identified at a fine degree of granularity).

In regard to dependent claim 16, representing said sequence of representation for each said record type within said data file (Aegerter at page 14 paragraph [0300], discloses the sequence number).

In regard to dependent claims 18-32 consecutively, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 2-16 consecutively, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claims 34-42 consecutively, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 2-10 consecutively, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

In regard to dependent claim 43, wherein said record break information comprises one or more line termination characters, however (Wanderski at col. 4, lines 25-45, discloses an xml parser whereby a DTD is dynamically generated in a manner of presentation to user context design, wherein the xml is a well-formed notation (i.e. opening tags corresponding closing tags for example: <email/>)).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teaching of Aegerter, provides computer-implemented system and methods for deploying a distributed client-server system, enabling read-write distributed data interfaces for host database systems, to includes an xml parser whereby a DTD (document type definition), the tags of a document is utilized for dynamically generated the output document. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide user the ability to define their own tags, to define data model by parsing the tags of the data model from the received document, the receiving application can re-create the information for display, printing, or other processing, as the generating application intended it (as taught by Wanderski at col. 2, lines 25-45).

In regard to dependent claim 44, wherein said record break information comprises one or more record break characters, however (Wanderski at col. 4, lines 25-45, discloses an xml parser whereby a DTD is dynamically generated in a manner of presentation to user context design, wherein the xml is a well-formed notation (i.e. opening tags corresponding closing tags for example: <email/>)).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teaching of Aegerter, provides computer-implemented system and methods for deploying a distributed client-server system, enabling read-write distributed data interfaces for host database systems, to includes an xml parser whereby a DTD (document type definition), the tags of a document is utilized for dynamically generated the output document. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide user the ability to define their own tags, to define data

model by parsing the tags of the data model from the received document, the receiving application can re-create the information for display, printing, or other processing, as the generating application intended it (as taught by Wanderski at col. 2, lines 25-45).

In regard to dependent claim 45, wherein said field break information comprises one or more character type transitions, however (Wanderski at col. 4, lines 25-45, discloses an xml parser whereby a DTD is dynamically generated in a manner of presentation to user context design, wherein the xml is a well-formed notation (i.e. opening tags corresponding closing tags for example: <email/>)).

It would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified the teaching of Aegerter, provides computer-implemented system and methods for deploying a distributed client-server system, enabling read-write distributed data interfaces for host database systems, to includes an xml parser whereby a DTD (document type definition), the tags of a document is utilized for dynamically generated the output document. One of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to perform such a modification to provide user the ability to define their own tags, to define data model by parsing the tags of the data model from the received document, the receiving application can re-create the information for display, printing, or other processing, as the generating application intended it (as taught by Wanderski at col. 2, lines 25-45).

In regard to dependent claim 46, wherein said field break information comprises one or more character counts, (Aegerter at page 11 paragraphs [0233]-[0234], discloses program counter by performing the operation implied by the instruction addressed reflecting of variable and parameter declarations introduce symbols).

In regard to dependent claims 47-52 consecutively, incorporate substantially similar subject matter as cited in claims 14-16 consecutively, and are similarly rejected along the same rationale.

Conclusion

8. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Chrisfort et al. US 20020078168A1 issued 06/2000

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Quoc A. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272- 4103. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30AM to 5:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (571) 272-4124. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for Published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only.

For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Quoc A. Tran - Patent Examiner - Technology Center 2176 - June 16, 2005

William L. Bashore
WILLIAM BASHORE
PRIMARY EXAMINER
6/22/2005